



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,907	03/02/2004	Jochen Thomas	2003 P 54322 US	1415

48154 7590 07/11/2006

SLATER & MATSIL LLP
17950 PRESTON ROAD
SUITE 1000
DALLAS, TX 75252

EXAMINER

AU, BAC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/790,907

Applicant(s)

THOMAS ET AL.

Examiner

Bac H. Au

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 53-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 18 June 2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 53-91 in the reply filed on December 21, 2005 is acknowledged.

IDS

2. NPL reference, Author - Kim, G., was not considered by examiner as the received document could not be scanned. Applicant can resend the document in a different form with the response to this Office Action, so that it could be considered prior to the next Office Action.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because "ground plane **214**" is not identified in Fig.2a. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

Art Unit: 2822

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 73 and 86 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 73, "the spacer" in line 7 of the claim should be --a spacer--.

Regarding claim 86, "claim 86" in line 1 should be --claim 85--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 53-54, 56-59, 65-66, and 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079).

Regarding claim 53, Kang [Fig.1] discloses a method of forming a stacked-die assembly, the method comprising:

providing a substrate [110] with contacts [125] formed on a top surface;

placing a bottom side of a first die [130₁] over the top surface of the substrate, the first die having a top side with a redistribution layer;

placing a spacer over the first die [140₁];

placing a bottom side of a second die [130₂] over the spacer, the second die having a first side with a redistribution layer; and

electrically coupling wire leads [150] from the re-routed bond pads [145] of the first die and the second die to the contacts.

Kang [Col.2 lines 36-40] discloses a redistribution layer on each die to redistribute bond pads, but fails to explicitly disclose a redistribution layer that comprises conductive lines that redistribute bond pads located on a right side and a left side of a first gap in an interior region to corresponding re-routed bond pads in a periphery region.

However, Chia [Fig.2] discloses a redistribution layer [24] that comprises conductive lines [26,32] that redistribute bond pads [20c,20d] located on a right side and a left side of a first gap in an interior region to corresponding re-routed bond pads [28] in a periphery region. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chia into the method of Kang to include a redistribution layer that comprises conductive lines that redistribute bond pads located on a right side and a left side of a first gap in an interior region to

corresponding re-routed bond pads in a periphery region. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Kang in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of redistributing the interconnect pattern on the die when the bond pads are not suitably placed [Kang; col.2 lines 36-40].

Regarding claims 54, 56-59, 65-66, and 68-69, Kang and Chia disclose wherein the step of electrically coupling is performed by wire bonding [Kang; 150 of Fig.1];

wherein the first die is identical in structure to the second die [Kang; 130₁ and 130₂ of Fig.1];

wherein the first and second dies comprise dynamic random access memory devices [Chia; para.66 lines 5-8];

wherein the first and second dies comprise double-data rate dynamic random access memory devices, each memory device including at least 512 Mb of memory cells [Both Kang and Chia disclose methods as applied to memory devices. It would be obvious that the memory devices would include dies that comprise double-data rate dynamic random access memory devices, each memory device including at least 512 Mb of memory cells.];

wherein, for both the first and second dies, the bond pads are positioned in a left column and a right column running parallel to a center line through the interior region, each bond pad in the left column being located to the left of the center line and each bond pad in the right column being located to the right of the center line, wherein the

redistribution layer routes a plurality of bond pads from the right column across the center line to corresponding re-routed bond pads on the left side of the semiconductor device and also routes a plurality of bond pads from the left column across the center line to corresponding re-routed bond pads on the right side of the semiconductor device [Chia; Fig.2];

wherein, for both the first and second dies, the re-routed bond pads comprise elongated bond pads extending from an edge of the die toward the interior region of the die, wherein electrically coupling wire leads comprises: for the first die, attaching wires to the re-routed bond pads at a portion of the re-routed bond pads nearer the edge of the first die; and for the second die, attaching wires to the re-routed bond pads at a portion of the re-routed bond pad nearer the interior region of the second die [Kang, col.2 lines 27-28, discloses the stacked dies can each be an integrated circuit or chip; it is obvious that it could include devices with various bond pad arrangements with redistribution trace and pad locations where wire bonding can take place.];

wherein the redistribution layer of the first and second dies comprise a multi-layer [36a-c] structure [Chia; Fig.9];

wherein the first die and the second die are both formed on a silicon substrate [Kang; col.2 lines 20-22] and wherein the spacer comprises a silicon spacer [Kang; col.3 lines 8-10];

wherein the substrate [110] includes at least one wiring layer formed inside the substrate, the wiring layer electrically coupling the contact pads [125] to conductive balls [125] on a second surface of the substrate [Kang; Fig.1].

6. Claims 55 and 70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) as applied to claims 53-54 above, and further in view of Lo (U.S. Pub. 2003/0160312).

Kang and Chia fail to explicitly disclose the limitations of claims 55 and 70-72.

However, Lo discloses

wherein the wire bonding is performed further to the interior of the second [18] die relative to the bonding of the first [12] die [Fig.1];

wherein placing the first die over the substrate comprises adhering the first die to the substrate with tape [Para.33 lines 7-11];

wherein placing the first die over the substrate comprises printing an adhesive over the substrate and placing the first die in the adhesive [Para.33 lines 7-11];

wherein electrically coupling wire leads from the re-routed bond pads of the first die and the second die to contacts formed in the substrate comprises electrically coupling wire leads from the re-routed bond pads of the first die [Step 142] before placing a spacer over the first die [Step 144] and electrically coupling wire leads from the re-routed bond pads of the second die [Step 150] after placing the second die over the spacer [Fig.5].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lo into the method of Kang and Chia to include the limitations of claims 55 and 70-72. The ordinary artisan would have

been motivated to modify Kang and Chia in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of effectively stacking different sized dies.

7. Claims 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) as applied to claims 53 and 56 above, and further in view of Itoh (U.S. Pat. 4439841).

Kang and Chia fail to explicitly disclose the limitations of claims 60-64. However, Itoh [Figs.1-4] discloses a method

wherein the redistribution layer of each of first and second dies includes a ground plane, the ground plane including a line [7,7',7'',7'''] substantially encircling the re-routed bond pads and a plurality ground lines that surround some of the re-routing lines;

wherein a plurality of the bond pads comprise data input/output bond pads, wherein the plurality ground lines [7,7',7'',7'''] surround some but not all of the re-routing lines, and wherein the plurality ground lines surround re-routing lines that are electrically coupled to the data input/output bond pads;

wherein the redistribution layer of the first die includes a first ground plane and wherein the redistribution layer of the second die includes a second ground plane [This is obvious];

wherein the first ground plane and the second ground plane each comprise ground lines [7,7',7'',7'''] adjacent a left side and a right side of a plurality of the conductive lines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Itoh into the method of Kang and Chia to include the limitations of claims 60-64. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Kang and Chia in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of improving memory device circuitry with increased signal transmission speed [Itoh; col.2 lines 19-22].

8. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) as applied to claims 53 and 66 above, and further in view of Lin (U.S. Pub. 2004/0126927).

Kang and Chia fail to explicitly disclose the limitations of claim 67. However, Lin [Fig.44] discloses a method wherein redistribution layer [640] comprises: a titanium layer; a copper layer formed on the titanium layer; a nickel layer formed on the copper layer; and a gold layer formed on the nickel layer [Para.79 lines 11-17]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lin into the method of Kang and Chia to include wherein redistribution layer comprises: a titanium layer; a copper layer formed on the titanium layer; a nickel layer formed on the copper layer; and a gold layer formed on the nickel layer. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Kang and Chia in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of providing improved metallization contacts to enhance assemble reliability [Lin; para.12 lines 1-2].

9. Claims 73-78, 84-85, and 87-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) and Lo (U.S. Pub. 2003/0160312).

Regarding claim 73, Kang and Chia disclose most of the limitations as discussed above in claim 53. Kang and Chia fail to explicitly disclose wherein the first die is a different size than the second die and the second die is positioned on the first die such that the re-routed bond pads of the first die are not covered by the second die. However, Lo [Fig.1] discloses a method wherein the first die [12] is a different size than the second die [18] and the second die is positioned on the first die such that the re-routed bond pads of the first die are not covered by the second die. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lo into the method of Kang and Chia to include wherein the first die is a different size than the second die and the second die is positioned on the first die such that the re-routed bond pads of the first die are not covered by the second die. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Kang and Chia in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of effectively stacking different sized dies.

Kang, Chia, and Lo disclose the limitations of claims 74-78, 84-85, and 87-91 as previously discussed above in the rejection of claims 53-59, 65-66, and 68-72.

Claims 79-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) and Lo (U.S. Pub. 2003/0160312) and further in view of Itoh (U.S. Pat. 4439841).

Kang, Chia, Lo, and Ito disclose the limitations of claims 79-83 as previously discussed above in the rejection of claims 60-64.

Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Pat. 6943294) in view of Chia (U.S. Pub. 2003/0227079) and Lo (U.S. Pub. 2003/0160312) and further in view of Lin (U.S. Pub. 2004/0126927).

Kang, Chia, Lo, and Lin disclose the limitations of claim 86 as previously discussed above in the rejection of claims 67.

Conclusion


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bac H. Au whose telephone number is 571-272-8795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2822

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BHA


Zandra V. Smith
Supervisory Patent Examiner
10 July 2004